

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 6-20 remain pending in the present application. Claims 2-5 and 21-27 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 6, 9 and 18 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 9-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 9 has been amended to clarify the last three lines and is now believed to be allowable along with its dependent claims, Claims 10-17. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 6-8 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 6-185562 to Tamaru, et al. Claim 5 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 5 depended from Claim 4 which depended from Claim 3 which depended from Claim 2 which depended from Claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of Claims 2-5 and Claims 2-5 have been cancelled. Thus, Applicant believes Claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 6-8, which

ultimately depend from Claim 1, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.


Claim 18 has been amended to include limitations similar to those of Claim 1 and thus, Claim 18 is also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 19 and 20, which ultimately depend from Claim 18, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 24, 2005

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg